## REMARKS

The Official Action of March 13, 2006, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 11-20, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1 and 4-10 have been canceled and new claims 19 and 20 added. Claims 11-20 remain in the application for consideration.

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 4-8 and 10-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicant has amended the claims to eliminate each of the problems identified by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has now been overcome.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1, 4-7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Thompson and claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Thompson further in view of Horstman.

In response to these rejections, Applicant has canceled claims 1-10. Applicant notes that the Examiner has

not rejected claims 11-18 on the basis of prior art.
Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-18
are now allowable along with new dependent claims 19-20, and
that this application is now in condition for allowance.

The prior art documents made of record and not
relied upon have been noted along with the implication that
such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently
pertinent to warrant their applications against any of
applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are
earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By_____
    Norman J. Latker
    Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\R\rau\Gutberlet4\Pto\Amendment-B.doc